

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS -P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,382	09/10/2003	Jason A. Graetz	CTJPL.008A	6022
20995	7590 07/03/2006		EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			LEE, CYNTHIA K	
2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
IRVINE, CA 92614			1745	
			DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Asking Commence	10/660,382	GRAETZ ET AL.	/
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cynthia Lee	1745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDON	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 S	September 2003.		
· ·	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under a condition.	· ·		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-35 are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	cepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		···	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	·		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicatority documents have been received in (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summan	y (PTO-413)	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail D		

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- 1. Claims 1-20, drawn to an electrode, classified in class 204, subclass 280.
- II. Claims 21-25, drawn to a nanoparticle and a method of making thereof, classified in class 977, subclass 773.
- III. Claims 26-52, drawn to a secondary electrochemical cell, classified in class 429, subclass 212.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the electrode can be used with a nanoparticle or a nanofilm. The subcombination has separate utility such as a nanoparticle for silicon chips.

Inventions II and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the electrochemical cell can be

Art Unit: 1745

used with a nanofilm. The subcombination has separate utility such as a nanoparticle for silicon chips.

Inventions I and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the electrochemical cell can be used with a nanoparticle or a nanofilm, as specified in [0048]. The subcombination has separate utility such as an electrode for a pH meter.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

If Group I is elected, an election of species is required. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Application/Control Number: 10/660,382

Art Unit: 1745

I-a Claims 1-12, An electrode that may require carbon black

I-b Claims 13-20, An electrode that does not require carbon black

Page 4

The species are distinct because they all have different (materials/composition) as set forth above (see MPEP 809.02(a)). Accordingly, each species requires a different field of search (see MPEP 808.02). Thus, there is a patentable difference between the species as claimed and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated above is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

If Group III is elected, an election of species is required. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

- I-a Claims 26-31, An electrochemical cell that may require carbon black
- I-b Claims 32-35, An electrochemical cell that does not require carbon black

The species are distinct because they all have different (materials/composition) as set forth above (see MPEP 809.02(a)). Accordingly, each species requires a different field of search (see MPEP 808.02). Thus, there is a patentable difference between the species as claimed and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated above is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Application/Control Number: 10/660,382 Page 6

Art Unit: 1745

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cynthia Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-8699. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/660,382 Page 7

Art Unit: 1745

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ckl

PATRICK JOSEPH RYAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER